BEFORE THE

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

IN THE MATTER OF

The Application of Block Island Power)
Company for an Increase in its Rates)
And Charges For Electric Service)

Docket No. 3655

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF WITNESS BRUCE R. OLIVER

On Behalf of

The Division of Public Utilities

April 7, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAC	<u>}E</u>
١.	INTRODUCTION	. 1
11.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	. 4
III.	CLASS COSTS OF SERVICE	. 7
IV.	RATE DESIGN	. 9
V.	IRP AND DSM	21

1		I. INTRODUCTION
2		
3	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS FOR THE
4		RECORD.
5	A.	My name is Bruce R. Oliver. My business address is 7103 Laketree Drive,
6		Fairfax Station, Virginia, 22039.
7		
8	Q.	BY WHOM AND IN WHAT CAPACITY ARE YOU EMPLOYED?
9	A.	I am employed by Revilo Hill Associates, Inc., and serve as President of the firm.
10		I manage the firm's business and consulting activities, and I direct its preparation
11		and presentation of economic, utility planning, and policy analyses for our clients.
12		
13	Q.	ON WHOSE BEHALF DO YOU APPEAR IN THIS PROCEEDING?
14	A.	My testimony in this proceeding is presented on behalf of the Division of Public
15		Utilities (hereinafter "the Division").
16		
17	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS
18		PROCEEDING?
19	A.	This testimony addresses portions of the request of Block Island Power
20		Company (hereinafter "BIPCo" or "the Company") for an increase in its rates and
21		charges for electric service that was filed on December 17, 2004. More
22		specifically, this testimony discusses the Company's costs of service by

1		customer class, BIPCo's proposed design of rates for recovery of its requested
2		revenue increase, as well as demand-side planning and capacity planning
3		issues.
4		
5	Q.	WERE YOU THE DIVISION'S RATE STRUCTURE WITNESS IN THE LAST
6		BASE RATE PROCEEDING FOR BLOCK ISLAND POWER COMPANY?
7	A.	Yes, I was.
8		
9	Q.	HAVE YOU DESIGNED ELECTRIC RATES FOR OTHER ISLAND UTILITIES?
10	A.	Yes, I have assisted public utilities commissions in the U.S. territories of Guam
11		and the Virgin Islands with the design of electric rates for island utility operations
12		in each of those jurisdictions.
13		
14		II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
15		
16	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE KEY FINDINGS OF THIS TESTIMONY?
17	A.	My review and analysis of the Company's rate structure recommendations yields
18		the following observations:
19		
20		✓ The class cost of service analyses that I have performed do <u>not</u> find a
21		strong correspondence between costs of service and revenue at present
22		rates for the test year in this proceeding. Of particular concern is my

1		finding that revenue for the Demand-Metered General Service, Rate "D"
2		class appears to fall well below its allocated costs for the test year.
3		
4	✓	No clear demarcation between summer and winter months can be identi-
5		fied for BIPCo. Therefore, the determination of appropriate seasonal
6		periods for the Company requires the exercise of considerable judgment.
7		Still, I do not find a compelling case for altering BIPCo's current seasonal
8		rating period definitions at this time.
9		
10	✓	BIPCo's current rate schedule for Street Lighting service, Rate "S," does
11		not adequately or appropriately price the service being provided, and it
12		requires some revisions in both language and pricing to more accurately
13		describe and price that service.
14		
15	✓	The Company's limited efforts to date to evaluate generation supply
16		alternatives leave much to be desired.
17		
18	✓	Given BIPCo's costs for oil-fired generation, cooperative efforts between
19		the Company, the Town of New Shoreham, and other stakeholders to
20		identify more cost-effective generation supply and/or demand manage-
21		ment alternatives may be well advised.
22		

1		✓	Due to BIPCo's extremely small size it may not be reasonable or
2			appropriate to hold the Company to the same standards for integrated
3			resource planning as larger utilities. Despite the Company's compara-
4			tively high costs of oil-fired generation, BIPCo's expenditure of large
5			amounts of time and resources to develop and implement a well-
6			developed integrated resource plan may not be cost-effective for
7			ratepayers.
8			
9	Q.	WHAT	F ACTIONS DO YOU RECOMMEND THAT THIS COMMISSION TAKE
10		BASE	D ON THE FINDINGS OF YOUR ANALYSES FOR THIS PROCEEDING?
11	A.	My red	commendations for the Commission are threefold:
12			
13		1.	The Commission should deny BIPCo's request to alter the defin-
14			itions of its current seasonal rating periods.
15			
16		2.	The Commission should require that any approved revenue
17			increase for BIPCo that results from this proceeding be distributed
18			among rate classes in a manner that moves rates for all classes in
19			the direction of their indicated costs of service.
20			
21		3.	The Commission should revise BIPCO's Street Lighting Service
22			rate as proposed herein.

1		
2		4. The Commission should encourage the formation of a working
3		group of stakeholders, experts, and interested parties to assist
4		BIPCo in the assessment of generation supply and demand-side
5		management alternatives. The Commission should also oversee
6		the activities of that working group to ensure that its efforts
7		progress in a cooperative and timely manner.
8		
9		III. CLASS COSTS OF SERVICE
10		
11	Q.	HAS THE COMPANY OFFERED ANY ASSESSMENT OF THE RELATION
12		SHIP BETWEEN ITS COSTS OF SERVICE AND REVENUE BY RATE
13		CLASSIFICATION IN THIS PROCEEDING?
14	A.	No, it has not. Although it has been a considerable time since BIPCo's last base
15		rate proceeding, the Company's rate proposals in this case appear to start from
16		the presumption that cost and revenue relationships by class have not changed
17		and, therefore, a uniform distribution among classes of the Company's requested
18		revenue increase is reasonable.
19		
20	Q.	HAVE YOU PREPARED A CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY FOR BIPCO
21		FOR THIS PROCEEDING?

A. Yes. Using test year data, I have developed a fully allocated embedded cost study that allocates responsibility for BIPCo's expenses and rate base among the various classifications of customers that it serves. A summary of the results of that study are provided in Schedule BRO-1.

I must note up front that by industry standards, this study is somewhat crude. Given limits imposed by the available data, a number of allocations were premised on proxy measures of demand to assess class contributions to costs. For example, since no individual class load research data is available for BIPCo, proxy measures of peak load contributions by class were developed based on average use in the peak month. Likewise, BIPCo does not appear to have systems in place that can readily generate some types of information commonly used by larger utilities to guide allocations or assignments of certain types of distribution system and/or customer-related costs.

Α.

Q. WHAT DO THE RESULTS IN SCHEDULE BRO-1 INDICATE?

Schedule BRO-1 indicates that for the test year substantial differences existed in the relationship between revenue and cost responsibilities by rate schedule. Although the overall return for the Company in the test year is negative, two classes, Commercial General (Rate "G") and Public Authority (Rate "P") are found to have positive rates of return indicating that the revenue those classes generate exceed their allocated costs for the test year. On the other hand, the computed rate of return for Commercial Demand (Rate "D") is noticeably below

the system average while the rate of return for Street Lighting (Rate "S") is just slightly below the system average. These results suggest that the revenue generated from Rates "D" and "S" in the test year did fall short of their allocated cost responsibilities. Finally, the Residential class (Rate "R") rate of return, although negative, is above the system average rate of return indicating that its revenue to cost ratio was better than that for the overall system.

Recognizing that cost allocation is not an exact science and that this study in particular is somewhat crude, I would not advocate precise adherence to these results in the design of rates by class. However, I do believe that these results provide a general indication of the relative performance of classes, and I would use these results to guide the distribution among rate classes of any revenue increase in this proceeding.

`ŧ

IV. RATE DESIGN

Q. WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF THE REVENUE INCREASE THAT BIPCO SEEKS

17 IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. The Company's filing indicates that it is seeking an increase in base revenue of \$463,171 or 21.96%.

Q. HOW DOES THE COMPANY PROPOSE TO DESIGN RATES TO RECOVER ITS REQUESTED REVENUE INCREASE IF THAT INCREASE IS APPROVED?

A. BIPCo's proposal for recovery of its requested revenue increase has two key components.

First, the Company proposes to expand its summer seasonal rating period from four months to six months. At present, summer rates are applied only in the months of June through September. BIPCo proposes to expand its summer period definition to include the months of May through October, and correspondingly reduce its winter seasonal period from eight months to six. Since many of BIPCO's current summer charges are greater than its comparable winter charges, expansion of the summer season would noticeably increase its annual revenue. In that context, BIPCo suggests that revenue gained through the expansion of its summer rating period can be used to reduce the overall percentage increase by which its existing rates would need to be increased to generate the level of additional revenue that it seeks.

Second, BIPCo proposes that the remainder of any rate increase be spread among its current rates and charges on an across-the-board basis.

ķ

Q. HOW DOES THE COMPANY ATTEMPT TO JUSTIFY ITS PROPOSED AP-PROACH TO THE DESIGN OF RATES IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. BIPCo offers several arguments in support of its proposed change in seasonal rating period definitions, but it offers no specific support for its proposed across-the-board distribution of the revenue increase that it requests.

1		The Company's support for changing its current summer seasonal rating
2	perio	d includes:
3		
4	✓	A belief that, during the past 13 years, travel to the island during
5		shoulder months (i.e., May and October) has expanded such that
6		those months would now be more appropriately included in the
7		summer seasonal rating period.
8		
9	✓	A suggestion that expansion of the summer period on an
10		emergency basis could help the Company avoid the reporting of a
11		loss for FYE 2005.
12		
13	✓	A review of the distribution of actual electric use by month for six (6)
14		commercial customers that BIPCo claims supports the proposition
15		that a change in the seasonal periods is warranted.
16		
17	√	A suggestion that expanding the current summer rating periods to
18		include the months of May and October would generate additional
19		annual revenue for the Company without increasing any of the
20		rates for electric service within the charges. That, in turn, would
21		reduce the magnitude of the increase required in the Company's
22		other charges for electric service.

season that would include the months of April through October. Although Customer F has uniformly low use in the months of November through April, I find that the usage for Customer F in the months of September, October, and May, is more closely aligned with its winter use than its peak summer use. On that basis, the data for Customer F would suggest a much narrower summer period definition than BIPCO has proposed.

Q. DO YOU OFFER ANY ADDITIONAL ANALYTIC DATA TO SUPPORT YOUR ASSESSMENT OF APPROPRIATE SUMMER AND WINTER PERIOD DEFINITIONS FOR BIPCO?

Yes. Viewed in the context of distributions or use by month either for entire rate classes or for the system data as whole, as opposed to individual customer data, I find that usage levels for the months of May and October are more closely aligned with usage levels for winter months than those for summer months. These relationships are illustrated by the data provided in Schedule BRO-2 and Schedule BRO-3. Schedule BRO-2 provides percent of annual use by month by rate class for calendar year 2004. Schedule BRO-3 adds some historical perspective for BIPCo's fiscal years 2001-2004. These data consistently show that May and October usage for each of the major rate classes and for the system as a whole are more consistent with winter than summer usage levels.

,	Œ.	10 THERE ROOM FOR SOME DISCRETION IN THE DETERMINATION OF
2		SUMMER AND WINTER SEASONAL PERIODS FOR RATE DESIGN PUR-
3		POSES?
4	A.	Yes. The treatment of shoulder months in the development of seasonal rating
5		periods generally requires the exercise of considerable judgment. Thus, for
6		BIPCO, as well as many other utilities, seasonal rating period determinations
7		must be viewed as part of the "art" of rate design. Still, key concerns in the
8		establishment of seasonal rates for BIPCO are (1) the provision of appropriate
9		price signals to customers and (2) equitable distribution of costs responsibilities
10		between "year around" and "summer only" customers. In my assessment,
11		BIPCO's proposed expansion of its summer seasonal rating period does nothing
12		to improve the price signals provided to customers during peak usage months,
13		and may negatively affect the current distribution of cost responsibilities between
14		"year around" and "summer only" customers. Therefore, I recommend that the
15		current seasonal rating period definitions be retained.
16		
17	Q.	ONCE THE ISSUE OF SEASONAL RATING PERIOD DEFINITIONS IS
18		RESOLVED, DO YOU SUPPORT AN ACROSS-THE-BOARD DISTRIBUTION
19		OF ANY RATE INCREASE THAT THE COMMISSION MAY APPROVE AS A
20		RESULT OF THIS PROCEEDING?
21	A.	No, I do not. Rather, I encourage the Commission to distribute any approved
22		overall revenue increase for the Company among its rate classifications in a

1		manner that recognizes and attempts to narrow existing differences between
2		allocated cost responsibilities and revenue by class.
3		
4	Q.	HAVE YOU DESIGNED AN ALTERNATIVE SET OF RATES THAT WOULD
5		RECOVER THE COMPANY'S REQUESTED REVENUE INCREASE IN THIS
6		PROCEEDING?
7	A.	I have. Schedule BRO-4, page 1 of 8, summarizes the distribution of revenue
8		increase by class that I would recommend if the Commission approves the
9		Company's full revenue increase request. Schedule BRO-4, pages 2 through 8,
10		provide a set of rate designs that would produce the revenue by class reflected
11		on page 1 of Schedule BRO-4.
12		
13	Q.	WITNESS CATLIN FOR THE DIVISION RECOMMENDS A NOTICEABLY
14		SMALLER RATE INCREASE FOR BIPCO. HOW WOULD YOU ADJUST
15		YOUR RATE DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS TO REFLECT THE LOWER
16		OVERALL LEVEL OF REVENUE THAT MR. CATLIN RECOMMENDS?
17	Α.	Schedule BRO-5 provides the class revenue requirements and rates designs by
18		class that I would suggest if Mr. Catlin's revenue increase recommendation is
19		adopted.
20		
21	Q.	ARE THERE ANY FURTHER RATE DESIGN MATTERS THAT YOU WOULD
22		LIKE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME?

1	A.	Yes. I would like to address (a) the structure of BIPCo's Street Light Service
2		Schedule and (b) the Company's proposed surcharge for recovery of costs for
3		Demand-Side Management (DSM) planning and Integrated Resource Planning.

Α.

Q. WHAT ASPECTS OF THE COMPANY'S STREET LIGHTING SERVICE RATES DO YOU WISH TO ADDRESS?

On the basis of my analyses for this proceeding, I find that the current design of BIPCo's Street Lighting Service Schedule, Rate "S," may warrant substantial revision. Both the Company's current and proposed rates for Street Lighting Service comprise a single monthly charge per lamp for "6,000 mean lumen" Mercury Vapor Lamps. This very simplistic structure does not adequately address the activities performed and services provided under that rate schedule. Importantly, the current per lamp charges do not differentiate charges for energy use from charges for owning, operating and maintaining Street Lighting facilities. In fact, at present it appears that BIPCo's energy sales data does not include any street light energy use. Although that use is not metered, street light operations are sufficiently constant over time to permit billing such energy use on an estimated basis. Moreover, proper recognition of street light energy use may help to reduce the Company's reported lost and unaccounted for energy.

Furthermore, through informal discovery with the Company I learned that only a portion of the lamps currently served under this rate are 6,000 mean lumen Mercury Vapor lamps. The Company is in a period of transition converting

to use of primarily High Pressure Sodium Lamps which are more energy efficient and have longer expected lives. At this time roughly 25% of the lamps served under BIPCo's Street Light Service rate schedule are High Pressure Sodium fixtures and another 25% of the current lamps are incandescent. Thus, only about half the lamps currently served under this rate schedule are properly classified as Mercury Vapor lamps.

Finally, although energy is provided to street lights under this rate schedule, it appears that this rate schedule is not subject to BIPCO's Fuel Adjustment Charge "FAC." As a result, street light energy use has been insulated from responsibility for an appropriate share of the fuel cost increases that other BIPCo customers have experienced in recent years. This is an inappropriate oversight that should be remedied in this proceeding. Although I do not find sufficient data at this point to differentiate BIPCo's non-energy charges for Street Light Service by type of lamp, many utilities do make such distinctions within their street light service schedules, and an effort should be made to better reflect such cost differences for BIPCo's street light service in the future.

19 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE CHANGES THAT SHOULD BE MADE TO 20 BIPCO'S STREET LIGHT SERVICE RATE.

21 A. The changes I propose to BIPCo's Street Light Service Schedule, Rate "S" are 22 as follows:

1		
2		Establish separate charges for:
3		
4		a. Street Light facilities and servicing;
5		b. Energy use (where energy use would be billed on the basis of lamp
6		wattage and estimated monthly street light burning hours).
7		
8		2. Apply the "FAC" to estimated monthly street light energy use.
9		
10		3. Prepare for further differentiation of charges based on lamp type in the
11		future.
12		
13	Q.	DO YOU SUPPORT BIPCO'S PROPOSALS FOR A SURCHARGE TO RE-
14		COVER IRM AND DSM COSTS?
15	A.	I do in concept, but I have reservations regarding the scope and magnitude of
16		costs to be included in such a surcharge as well as the time period over which
17		such costs should be recovered.
18		
19	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR RESERVATIONS REGARDING THE COMPANY'S
20		SURCHARGE?
21	A.	My reservations regarding the Company's surcharge proposal are at least
22		fivefold.

First, the parameters of the Company proposal are not well founded. BIPCo seeks a mechanism that would provide for recovery of a total of \$250,000 over five years, yet its current estimates of the costs to be incurred are only in the range of \$95,000 - \$115,000. The discrepancy here is too large, particularly considering that BIPCo's cost estimates lack substantial support. This proposed surcharge should not serve as a back-door mechanism for improving the Company's cash-flow. Moreover, activities of this nature tend to grow to absorb whatever funds are made available, regardless of the productivity of such activities. If initial funding of these activities is set well in excess of any well-founded estimate of their costs, the need for exercise of close oversight over those expenditures increases.

Second, in the context of the size of the rate increase that BIPCO seeks in this docket, the roughly 1.6% additional increase on total annual revenue that the proposed surcharge would impose should not be treated lightly. Thus, it is imperative that whatever funds are spent in the pursuit of IRP and DSM objectives need to be utilized as cost-effectively as possible. For a utility of this size it is quite possible that the costs of planning and implementation might overwhelm the value of expected benefits from those activities.

Third, the period over which the Company proposes to recover the referenced IRP and DSM costs does not correspond well with the period over which ratepayers would expect to experience benefits from such expenditures. BIPCo's proposal would recover the entirety of such costs over five years, but the

period of benefit from those expenditures should be expected to extend throughout the Company's planning horizon (i.e., at least 15 years).

Fourth, recovery of IRP and DSM costs through a uniform cents per kWh charge applied to all kWh of annual sales may not appropriately distribute responsibility for those costs between "year around" and "summer only" users.

Fifth, the costs to be recovered through the proposed surcharge are too broadly described. At least for now, any such surcharge should be limited to planning costs. Considerations regarding the possible of use of this mechanism for the recovery of implementation costs should be deferred to a later date. This is particularly important since once the implementation stage is reached the potential interactions between surcharge cost recovery and costs and assumptions underlying the establishment of base rates increases.

A.

Q. WHAT ARE YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED SURCHARGE FOR RECOVERY OF IRP AND DSM COSTS?

As noted above, at least initially the surcharge mechanism should be limited to the recovery of IRM and DSM planning costs. Also, before any cost recovery through such a mechanism is authorized for those planning activities, a more detailed scope of work for those activities is needed such that more refined and reliable estimates of their costs may be developed. Once a better handle on the expected magnitude of such planning costs is obtained, the computation of annual amounts to be recovered through rates should reflect recovery of those

costs over the Company's planning horizon for generating capacity additions
(e.g., 15-years). This will serve to both reduce the impact of the surcharge on
customers' bills and provide a better matching of the timing of the cost impacts of
those activities with the benefits that are expected to result. Finally, the
surcharge mechanism should be designed to provide a reasonable distribution of
such planning costs between "summer only" and "year around" users of the
system. Although BIPCo's summer energy supply requirements contribute
heavily to the need for generation supply additions, all users may benefit
substantially if alternative are identified that reduced on-going generation supply
costs. For example, several supply-side alternatives (including an under sea
cable and on-island wind and solar generation) have the potential to yield
significant reductions in BIPCo's dependence on oil-fired generation and thereby
lower its on-going fuel expenses in a manner that benefits users of energy
throughout the year.

V. IRP AND DSM

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Α.

1

Q. HAS THE COMPANY ENGAGED IN INTREGRATED RESOURCE PLANNING TO DATE?

The Company has funded a study by HDR-SSR Engineers (HDR) that has analyzed the costs of energy supply alternatives for Block Island Power Company, but that study does not constitute integrated resource planning. It is important to recognize, however, that BIPCo does not have the in-house resources and expertise to perform the type of integrated planning that might be expected of larger utilities. For a small company such as BIPCo, there can be a substantial advantage to simply sticking with the types of generation supply options with which it has knowledge and is comfortable. However, from a consumer perspective serious consideration of a broader set of generation supply/DSM options may be viewed as imperative in the context of rapidly rising costs for oil-fired generation. In other words, Block Island consumers should not be forced to accept the cost of oil-fired generation when reasonable a potential for achieving lower costs through alternative technology exists. Thus, greater involvement of the Town of New Shoreham and other stakeholders and interested parties in the planning process may be more productive than efforts to place the onus of integrated planning directly on the Company.

21

1	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE HDR-SSR ENGINEERS
2		(HDR) DRAFT STUDY TITLED "ALTERNATIVE ENERGY ANALYSIS FOR
3		BLOCK ISLAND POWER COMPANY"?

Α.

For the amount of funding provided, the HDR study provides fairly detailed assessments of a number of alternative energy supply options. Unfortunately, that study does not consider either: (a) the feasibility and economics of an undersea cable to the mainland or (b) the integration of demand-side management programs. It is also premised on cost data that are somewhat out-of-date.

For example, recent escalation in fuel oil prices could substantially alter the estimated costs and benefits of energy supply and/or demand-side management options. The HDR study assumes a fuel oil cost of \$1.45 per gallon delivered. However, current NYMEX No. 2 fuel oil prices for this summer are in the range of \$1.62 per gallon without consideration of delivery charges. In addition, the HDR study assumes an 8.0% interest rate for financing capital expenditures, but it appears that BIPCo may be in position to finance any planned generation capacity expansion through RUS at a noticeably lower financing cost. The Company's access to lower cost financing could make generation supply and/or DSM options that require substantial up-front expenditures of capital more attractive.

Furthermore, the results of the HDR study do not represent an integrated resource plan. Questions regarding the optimal timing of supply and/or DSM program additions are not addressed, and no consideration of the potential for

use of a mix of supply-side and/or demand-side alternatives is provided. However, it is unclear at this point whether sufficient demand-side impacts on load are achievable to warrant the deferral of generation supply alternatives. After more than a decade of electric rates that include substantially higher summer month charges, there is no clear evidence of measurable consumer response to those price signals. If demand-side alternatives are to be included in an integrated resource plan, there must be a high degree of confidence that such alternatives can be relied upon to produce measurable load impacts of sufficient magnitude to be traded against often lumpy generation supply alternatives.

Α.

Q. SHOULD THE COMMISSION DIRECT BIPCO TO UNDERTAKE A FULL INTE-GRATED RESOURCE PLANNING STUDY AT THIS TIME?

To date, the Company's efforts to address resource planning issues do not seem to meet the expectations for such studies. Given BIPCo's limited resources and in-house expertise on these matters, placing the onus for further planning solely, or even primarily, on the Company in an adversarial and potentially litigious environment may not be the best solution. Rather, a cooperative investigation of these matters pursued jointly by the Town, the Company, and other stakeholders and interested parties may have greater potential for producing acceptable results for consumers and the Company.

Alternatively, if the Commission is inclined to order the Company to engage in a more comprehensive evaluation of generation supply and DSM alternatives, I would encourage the Commission to seek agreement among the parties regarding the scope and costs of such a study before ordering BIPCo to proceed. If the costs of a timely and well-scoped study remain within the bounds of overall cost-effectiveness, then the Commission could authorize the Company to proceed with such planning activities. However, the Commission and the parties must be sensitive to the fact that dollars spent on planning can erode the overall net benefits of generation supply and DSM alternatives. Thus, there are limits to the dollars that can be spent productively within a planning process. There should also be recognition that continuing litigation of IRP and DSM issues can add further unproductive expenditures to the planning process. regardless who is charged with leading the planning process for Block Island, it is essential that considerable effort be made to ensure that any resulting plan for capacity expansion and/or demand-side management programs have broad support among the affected parties.

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
- 20 A. Yes, it does.

21

Block Island Power Company Docket 3655

Test Year Class Cost of Service Study - Summary

			Commercial	ercial	Public	Street
Revenue/Expense Item	Total	Residential	General	Demand	Authority	Lighting
Revenue Operating Revenue						
Base Revenue	1,807,621	693,447	278,337	704,831	118,585	12,422
Fuel Surcharge	960,113	374,056	137,847	381,473	66,737	0
Total Revenue from Sales	2,767,734	1,067,503	416,184	1,086,304	185,322	12,422
Service Charges	16,049	6,206	2,420	6,316	1,038	70
Total Operating Revenue	2,783,783	1,073,709	418,604	1,092,620	186,360	12,492
Other Revenue	177,208	68,348	26,647	69,552	11,865	795
Miscellaneous Revenue	3,848	1,484	579	1,510	258	17
Total Revenue	2,964,839	1,143,541	445,829	1,163,682	198,483	13,304
Expenses			9	0	7	7
Operation & Maintence Expense	2,388,130	920,436	333,014	972,928	150,434	11,317
axes	206,452	80,445	30,117	82,346	12,315	1,230
Depreciation Expense	230,452	84,597	31,030	102,452	11,511	861
Other Deductions	255,025	95,226	36,783	106,734	15,225	1,056
Total Expenses	3,080,059	1,180,704	430,944	1,264,460	189,486	14,465
Net Income	-115,220	-37,163	14,885	-100,778	8,997	-1,161
Rate Base	4,097,657	1,900,349	695,887	2,057,385	274,621	39,770
% Return on Rate Base	-2.81%	-1.96%	2.14%	-4.90%	3.28%	-2.92%
Difference from System Avg ROR		%98.0	4.95%	-2.09%	%60.9	-0.11%

Block Island Power Company Docket 3655

Calendar Year 2004 Percent of Annual KWH Sales by Month (Rate Class and Total System)

CY 2004 Percent of Annual Use by Month

Total	100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	100.0%
Dec-04	6.7% 6.3% 4.1%	8.3% 7.5% 8.2%	5.7%
Vov-04	6.1% 4.6% 4.3%	7.7% 7.1% 7.7%	5.3%
Oct-04	7.1% 8.7% 7.3%	9.2% 7.7% 9.1%	7.5%
Sep-04	9.1% 10.1% 11.5%	7.4% 8.5% 7.5%	10.1%
Aug-04	13.7% 13.7% 16.3%	9.0% 7.8% 8.9%	14.4%
Jul-04	14.6% 14.7% 18.1%	10.0% 8.8% 9.9%	15.7%
Jun-04	9.1% 9.2% 11.6%	7.3% 5.2% 7.1%	10.0%
May-04	6.9% 6.7% 8.0%	8.7% 8.5% 8.7%	7.4%
Apr-04	6.0% 7.1% 5.1%	7.6% 8.1% 7.7%	2.9%
Mar-04	6.0% 5.6% 4.1%	8 9 8 8 8 9 % 4 % 8 1 % 8 1 %	5.3%
-eb-04	5.9% 5.3% 3.7%	7.4% 9.5% 7.6%	5.0%
Jan-04 Feb-04	8.9% 8.0% 5.9%	9.2% 11.9% 9.5%	7.6%
	Residential General Demand	Pub Demand Pub Non-Dem Total Public	Total KWH

Summer Winter

Block Island Power Company

Docket 3655

Historic Percent of Annual KWH Sales by Month by Rate Class and for Total System FY 2001 Through FY 2004

FY 2	001 Pe	rcent of	Annual	Use	by	Month	

	Jun-00	Jul-00	Aug-00	Sep-00	Oct-00	Nov-00	Dec-00	Jan-01	Feb-01	Mar-01	Apr-01	May-01	Total
Residential	8.7%	12.6%	13.9%	9.2%	7.9%	6.7%	8.0%	6.5%	6.0%	6.9%	6.0%	7.5%	100.0%
General	10.0%	14.0%	15.2%	10.6%		6.4%	7.5%	6.4%	5.5%	7.0%	5.8%	3.1%	100.0%
Demand	11.2%	16.7%	16.8%	11.2%	7.4%	4.9%	4.7%	4.0%	3.9%	- 5.7%	5.2%	8.1%	100.0%
Pub Demand	5.9%	6.8%	6.8%	6.6%	8.6%	7.7%	8.9%	7.9%	8.3%	9.3%	12.8%	10.4%	100.0%
Pub Non-Dem	8.0%	9.2%	10.3%	9.2%			7.5%	7.7%	7.8%	9.3%	8.0%	7.7%	100.0%
Total Public	6.1%	7.1%	7.2%	6.9%	8.6%	7.5%	8.7%	7.9%	8.3%	9.3%	12.2%	10.1%	100.0%
Total KWH	9.8%	14.2%	14.9%	10.1%	7.8%	6.0%	6.6%	5.5%	5.2%	6.6%	6.1%	7.3%	100.0%

FY 2002 Percent of Annual Use by Month

								,					
	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01	Jan-02	Feb-02	Mar-02	Apr-02	May-02	Total
Residential	8.7%	12.9%	13.7%	11.2%	7.6%	6.5%	7.8%	6.3%	5.7%	6.7%	5.9%	7.0%	100.0%
General	12.0%	15.3%	13.0%	12.0%	8.2%	6.7%	0.8%	6.3%	5.8%	6.8%	6.8%	6.2%	100.0%
Demand	11.4%	16.9%	17.2%	13.3%	6.9%	3.7%	4.5%	4.0%	4.0%	4.7%	5.6%	7.8%	100.0%
Pub Demand	7.2%	9.3%	8.9%	7.9%	8.8%	7.9%	9.1%	8.2%	7.7%	8.8%	7.9%	8.3%	100.0%
Pub Non-Dem	7.2%	9.3%	8.9%	7.9%	8.8%	7.9%	9.1%	8.2%	7.7%	8.8%	7.9%	8.3%	100.0%
Total Public	7.2%	9.3%	8.9%	7.9%	8.8%	7.9%	9.1%	8.2%	7.7%	8.8%	7.9%	8.3%	100.0%
Total KWH	10.2%	14.7%	14.7%	12.0%	7.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.1%	6.0%	6.1%	7.3%	100.0%

FY 2003 Percent of Annual Use by Month

	Jun-02	Jul-02	Aug-02	Sep-02	Oct-02	Nov-02	Dec-02	Jan-03	Feb-03	Mar-03	Apr-03	May-03	Total
Residential	9.4%	12.3%	12.5%	9.7%	7.1%	7.1%	6.9%	6.8%	7.3%	5.5%	8.4%	7.0%	100.0%
General	11.9%	13.3%	12.9%	11.9%	7.7%		8.3%	5.9%	6.4%	5.2%	1.3%	8.3%	100.0%
Demand	11.9%	16.1%	16.0%	12.3%	6.8%	5.0%	4.6%	4.6%	5.0%	4.8%	5.5%	7.3%	100.0%
Pub Demand	7.1%	11.5%	9.4%	8.3%	8.4%	8.6%	8.1%	7.4%	6.9%	7.5%	7.9%	8.8%	100.0%
Pub Non-Dem	7.4%	8.8%	9.5%	7.4%	7.3%	7.9%	7.7%	11.1%	8.8%	8.7%	7.5%	7,9%	100.0%
Total Public	7.2%	11.3%	9.4%	8.2%	8.3%	8.5%	8.0%	7.7%	7.1%	7.6%	7.9%	8.7%	100.0%
Total KWH	10.6%	13.9%	13.8%	11.0%	7.1%	6.3%	6.2%	5.8%	6.2%	5.3%	6.2%	7.4%	100.0%

FY 2004 Percent of Annual Use by Month

	Jun-03	Jul-03	Aug-03	Sep-03	Oct-03	Nov-03	Dec-03	Jan-04	Feb-04	Mar-04	Apr-04	May-04	Total
Residential	9.0%	13.1%	15.1%	7.9%	7.1%	6.9%	6.4%	9.1%	6.0%	6.1%	6.1%	7.0%	100.0%
General	10.4%	13.8%	15.7%	8.7%	7.4%	6.6%	5.6%	7.8%	5.1%	5.4%	6.9%	6.5%	100.0%
Demand	11.4%	16.7%	18.9%	9.8%	7.0%	4.9%	4.4%	5.9%	3.7%	4.1%	5.2%	8.0%	100.0%
Pub Demand	9.6%	9.1%	10.0%	5.8%	7.9%	7.9%	7.6%	9.5%	7.6%	8.2%	7.8%	9.0%	100.0%
Pub Non-Dem	7.4%	8.8%	9.5%	7.4%	7.3%	7.9%	7.7%	11.1%	8.8%	8.7%	7.5%	7.9%	100.0%
Total Public	9.4%	9.0%	9.9%	6.0%	7.9%	7.9%	7.6%	9.6%	7.8%	8.3%	7.8%	8.9%	100.0%
Total KWH	10.2%	14.4%	16.4%	8.7%	7.1%	6.1%	5.6%	7.6%	5.1%	5.4%	5.9%	7.5%	100.0%



Summer Winter

Block Island Power Company Docket 3655

Rate Design Summary - Division Rate Design & BIPCo Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

					Ba	Base Revenue	ne			Total Revenue	nue	
-		Annual	O	Current	Prop	Proposed	Increase	şe	Current	Proposed	Increase	se
ž	Rate Classification	KWH		Rates	Ra	Rates	\$	%	Rates	Rates	\$	%
₹~~	Residential Service Rate "R"	4,273,390	6 9	732,066	\$ 86	891,957	\$159,891	21.8%	\$ 1,128,539	\$ 1,288,430	\$159,891	14.2%
7	Commercial General Service - Rate "G"	1,548,103	€9	294,346	\$ 32	329,988	\$ 35,643	12.1%	\$ 440,454	\$ 476,097	\$ 35,643	8.1%
က	Commercial Demand Service - Rate "D"	4,544,181	69	746,787	66 \$	995,954	\$249,166	33.4%	\$ 1,151,122	\$ 1,400,289	\$249,166	21.6%
4	Public Authority Demand - Rate "P"	700,912	€9	112,760	\$	126,422	\$ 13,663	12.1%	\$ 176,392	\$ 190,055	\$ 13,663	7.7%
S	Public Authority Non-Demand - Rate "P"	78,245	69	12,879	€9	14,439	\$ 1,560	12.1%	\$ 19,983	\$ 21,543	\$ 1,560	7.8%
9	Street Lighting Service - Rate "S"	44,238 *	es.	13,163	€	16,506	\$ 3,342	25.4%	\$ 13,163	\$ 20,275	\$ 7,112	54.0%
7	Total Revenue from Sales	11,144,831	. €	\$ 1,912,001	\$ 2,37	\$ 2,375,265	\$463,265	24.2%	\$ 2,929,654	\$ 3,396,687	\$467,034	15.9%
∞	Other Revenue		છ	\$ 197,105	\$ 15	\$ 197,105		%0.0	\$ 197,105	\$ 197,105	· •	%0.0
თ	TOTAL REVENUE		\$	\$ 2,109,106	\$ 2,57	\$ 2,572,370	\$463,265	22.0%	\$ 3,126,759	\$ 3,593,792	\$467,034	14.9%

Not applicable under current rates.

Block Island Power Company Docket 3655

Residential (Rate "R") Rate Design - Division Rate Design & BIPCo Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

%	20.0% 20.0% 20.0%	22.7% 22.8% 22.7%	14.3%	21.8%	%0.0	14.2%
Increase	\$ 10,400 \$ 20,942 \$ 31,342	\$ 85,360 \$ 39,348 \$ 124,709	\$ 3,840	\$ 159,891	· \$	\$ 159,891
Revenue at Proposed Rate	\$ 62,400 \$ 125,652 \$ 188,052	\$ 460,985 \$ 212,200 \$ 673,185	\$ 30,720	\$ 891,957	\$ 396,473	\$ 1,288,430
Proposed Rate	\$ 12.00 \$ 12.00	\$ 0.2387	\$ 20.00		\$ 0.0928	
Revenue at Current Rate	\$ 52,000 \$ 104,710 \$ 156,710	\$ 375,625 \$ 172,851 \$ 548,476	\$ 26,880	\$ 732,066	\$ 396,473	\$ 1,128,539
Current Rate	\$ 10.00	\$ 0.1945	\$ 17.50		\$ 0.0928	
Service Units	5,200 10,471 15,671	1,931,232 2,342,158 4,273,390	1,536	a.	4,273,390	
Type of Charge	Customer Charges Summer Winter Total	Energy Charges Summer Winter Total	System Charges Summer Only	Subtotal Base Revenue	Fuel Surcharge	Rate "R" Total
N L	7 2 8	4 15 0	7	∞	თ	10

Block Island Power Company *Docket 3655*

Commercial General (Rate "G") Rate Design - Division Rate Design & BIPCo Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

Block Island Power Company Docket 3655

Commercial Demand (Rate "D") Rate Design - Division Rate Design & BIPCo Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

Kat	Kate Year - Current Seasonal Period	a renoa Deminons	É	n									
 	Type of Charge	Service Units	9	Current Rate	2	Revenue at Current Rate	Pre	Proposed Rate	<u>қ</u> д	Revenue at Proposed Rate		Increase	%
− α ω	Customer Charges Summer Winter Total	388 774 1,162	6 6	15.00	မ မ	5,820 11,610 17,430	७ ७	18.00	မ မ	6,984 13,932 20,916	မ မ	1,164 2,322 3,486	20.0% 20.0% 20.0%
4 10 0	Energy Charges Summer Winter Total	2,581,350 1,962,831 4,544,181	↔ ↔	0.1684	မှ မှ	434,699 164,878 599,577	\$ \$	0.2301	မ မ	593,969 225,333 819,302	\$ 156 \$ 66 \$ 219	\$ 159,269 \$ 60,455 \$ 219,724	36.6% 36.7% 36.6%
7 8 6	Demand Charges Summer Winter Total	6,551 6,303 12,854	& &	15.00	မ မ	98,265 31,515 129,780	\$ \$	18.00	မှ မှ မှ	117,918 37,818 155,736	8 8 8	19,653 6,303 25,956	20.0% 20.0% 20.0%
10	Subtotal Base Revenue	ø			↔	746,787			↔	995,954	\$248	\$249,166	33.4%
	Fuel Surcharge	4,544,181	₩	0.0890	ક્ક	404,335	↔	0.0890	€9	404,335	\$	1	%0.0
12	Rate "D" Total				↔	\$ 1,151,122			₩	\$ 1,400,289	\$24	\$249,166	21.6%

Block Island Power CompanyDocket 3655

Public (Rate "P") Demand Rate Design - Division Rate Design & BIPCo Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

					Revenue				æ	Revenue				
! 은 근	Type of Charge	Service Units	0	Current Rate	at Current Rate	ď.	Proposed Rate	sed	Pro	at Proposed Rate	11	Increase	% %	
τ 0 m	Customer Charges Summer Winter Total	72 144 216	क क	15.00	\$ 1,080 \$ 2,160 \$ 3,240	↔ ↔	8 6	18.00	မ မ	1,296 2,592 3,888	မှာ မှာ	216 432 648	20.00% 20.00% 20.00%	
4 10 0	Energy Charges Summer Winter Total	241,320 459,592 700,912	69 69	0.16360	\$ 39,480 \$ 37,595 \$ 77,075	↔ ↔	0.1775	775	မ မ	42,834 40,766 83,600	မ မ	3,354 3,171 6,526	8.50% 8.44% 8.47%	
~ 8 6	Demand Charges Summer Only Winter Total	1,350 2,439 3,789	↔ ↔	15.00	\$ 20,250 \$ 12,195 \$ 32,445	₩ ₩	<u>8</u> 0	6.00	မ မ မ	24,300 14,634 38,934	မ မ မ	4,050 2,439 6,489	20.00% 20.00% 20.00%	
10	Subtotal Base Revenue				\$112,760				↔	126,422	↔	\$ 13,663	12.12%	
7	Fuel Surcharge	700,912	↔	0.0908	\$ 63,633	↔	0.0908	806	8	63,633	ક		%00.0	
12	Rate "P" Demand Total				\$176,392				↔	190,055	↔	\$ 13,663	7.75%	

Block Island Power Company Docket 3655

Public (Rate "P") Non-Demand Rate Design - Division Rate Design & BIPCo Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

					å	Revenue at			ď	Revenue at			
18 5	Type of Charge	Service Units	٥	Current Rate	0	Current Rate	۾	Proposed Rate	Pr	Proposed Rate		Increase \$	ase %
	Customer Charges	52	₩	10.00	€	520	49	12.00	49	624	S	104	20.0%
- 2	Winter	104	↔	10.00	₩	1,040	· U	12.00	↔	1,248	₩	208	20.0%
က	Total	156			\$	1,560			₩	1,872	↔	312	20.0%
	Energy Charges												
4	Summer	25,947	ઝ	0.2000	υ	5,189	ઝ	0.2228	()	5,781	↔	265	11.4%
5	Winter	52,298	↔	0.1000	↔	5,230	ઝ	0.1114	↔	5,826	↔	296	11.4%
9	Total	78,245			S	10,419			↔	11,607	↔	1,188	11.4%
7	System Charges Summer Only	24	₩	37.50	8	006	⇔	40.00	ક્ક	096	↔	09	%2.9
∞	Subtotal Base Revenue				69	12,879			↔	14,439	₩	1,560	12.1%
6	Fuel Surcharge	78,245	↔	0.0908	ક	7,104	↔	0.0908	↔	7,104	↔	t	%0.0
10	Rate "P" Non-Demand Total	otal			s	19,983			↔	21,543	↔	1,560	7.8%

Block Island Power Company Docket 3655

Street Light (Rate "S") Rate Design - Division Rate Design & BIPCo Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

Ľ		Service	์ ਹ	Current	ē σ	Revenue at Current	Pro	ਰ	g ç	Revenue at Proposed		Increase	98
₽	Type of Charge	Units	_	Rate		Rate		Rate		Rate		\$	%
τ	Lamp Charge	852	↔	15.45	↔	13,163	↔	16.05	\$	13,675	↔	511	3.9%
7	Energy Charge	44,238	↔	1	€\$		€9	0.0640	8	2,831	↔	2,831	ΣZ
က	Subtotal Base Revenue				↔	13,163			↔	16,506	S	3,342	25.4%
4	Fuel Surcharge	44,238 *	69	1	€\$		€9	0.0852	&	3,769	ક	3,769	Z
2	Rate "S" Total				⇔	13,163			↔	20,275	↔	7,112	54.0%

Not applicable under current rates.

Block Island Power Company

Docket 3655

Revenue Increase by Type of Charge - Division Rate Design & BIPCo Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

- S	Rate Classification	Billing Units	Current Revenue	Proposed Revenue	Increase \$	%
₹	Total Customer Charge Revenue	20,811	\$ 215,000	\$ 258,000	\$ 43,000	20.0%
7	Total Energy Charge Revenue	11,189,069	\$ 1,480,567	\$ 1,862,081	\$381,513	25.8%
က	Total Demand Charge Revenue	16,643	\$ 162,225	\$ 194,670	\$ 32,445	20.0%
4	Total System Charge Revenue	1,939	\$ 41,045	\$ 46,840	\$ 5,795	14.1%
5	Total Street Lighting Charge Revenue	852	\$ 13,163	\$ 13,675	\$ 511	3.9%
9	Total Revenue from Sales		\$ 1,912,001	\$ 2,375,265	\$ 463,265	24.2%
7	Fuel Surcharge	11,189,069	\$ 1,017,653	\$ 1,021,422	\$ 3,769 #	0.4%
∞	Late Charge Revenue		\$ 15,499	\$ 15,499	. ↔	%0.0
თ	Other Revenue		\$ 181,758	* \$ 181,758	· Θ	%0.0
10	TOTAL REVENUE		\$ 3,126,911	\$ 3,593,944	\$ 467,034	14.9%
•	 Other Revenue (Per Catlin TSC-1, page 1 of 2) Removal for Non-Payment 		\$ 550			

[#] Fuel Surcharge revenue from Street Lighting would result in minor reductions in Fuel Surcharges for other classes. 1,489 175,719 4,000 181,758

Miscellaneous Revenue

Total

Interest Income Rent - Lease

Block Island Power Company Docket 3655

Rate Design Summary - Division Rate Design & Division Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

					æ	Base Revenue	ine			Total Revenue	nue	
-		Annual	3	Current	Prog	Proposed	Increase	Se Se	Current	Proposed	Increase	
ž	Rate Classification	KWH	œ	Rates	Ra	Rates	s	%	Rates	Rates	ક	%
1												
	Residential Service Rate "R"	4,273,390	8	732,066	\$	799,632	\$ 67,566	9.5%	\$ 1,128,539	\$ 1,196,105	\$ 67,566	2.99%
7	Commercial General Service - Rate "G"	1,548,103	89	294,346	જે ક	309,435	\$ 15,089	5.1%	\$ 440,454	\$ 455,543	\$ 15,089	3.43%
ო	Commercial Demand Service - Rate "D"	4,544,181	\$	746,787	∞ •••	850,532	\$103,745	13.9%	\$ 1,151,122	\$ 1,254,867	\$103,745	9.01%
4	Public Authority Demand - Rate "P"	700,912	\$	112,760	es —	118,519	\$ 5,760	5.1%	\$ 176,392	\$ 182,152	\$ 5,760	3.27%
5	Public Authority Non-Demand - Rate "P"	78,245	↔	12,879	69	13,546	\$ 667	5.2%	\$ 19,983	\$ 20,649	\$ 667	3.34%
9	Street Lighting Service - Rate "S"	44,238 *	s	13,163	es.	14,572	\$ 1,408	10.7%	\$ 13,163	\$ 18,341	\$ 5,177	39.33%
7	Total Revenue from Sales	11,144,831	\$ 1,0	\$ 1,912,001	\$ 2,1	\$ 2,106,236	\$194,235	10.2%	\$ 2,929,654	\$ 3,127,657	\$198,004	6.76%
∞	Other Revenue		φ.	\$ 197,105	\$	\$ 197,105	٠ ح	%0.0	\$ 197,105	\$ 197,105	-	0.00%
თ	TOTAL REVENUE		\$ 2,	\$ 2,109,106	\$ 2,3	\$ 2,303,341	\$194,235	9.5%	\$ 3,126,759	\$ 3,324,762	\$198,004	6.33%

Not applicable under current rates.

Block Island Power Company Docket 3655

Residential (Rate "R") Rate Design - Division Rate Design & Division Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

%	10.0% 10.0% 10.0%	8.7% 8.8% 8.8%	14.3%	9.2%	%0.0	%0.9
Increase \$	\$ 5,200 \$ 10,471 \$ 15,671	\$ 32,831 \$ 15,224 \$ 48,055	\$ 3,840	\$ 67,566	· &	\$ 67,566
Revenue at Proposed Rate	\$ 57,200 \$ 115,181 \$ 172,381	\$ 408,456 \$ 188,075 \$ 596,531	\$ 30,720	\$ 799,632	\$ 396,473	\$ 1,196,105
Proposed Rate	\$ 11.00 \$ 11.00	\$ 0.2115 \$ 0.0803	\$ 20.00		\$ 0.0928	
Revenue at Current Rate	\$ 52,000 \$ 104,710 \$ 156,710	\$ 375,625 \$ 172,851 \$ 548,476	\$ 26,880	\$ 732,066	\$ 396,473	\$ 1,128,539
Current Rate	\$ 10.00	\$ 0.1945 \$ 0.0738	\$ 17.50		\$ 0.0928	
Service Units	5,200 10,471 15,671	1,931,232 2,342,158 4,273,390	1,536	O	4,273,390	
Type of Charge	Customer Charges Summer Winter Total	Energy Charges Summer Winter Total	System Charges Summer Only	Subtotal Base Revenue	Fuel Surcharge	Rate "R" Total
S L	7 N N	4 0 0	7	80	თ	10

Block Island Power Company

Docket 3655

Commercial General (Rate "G") Rate Design - Division Rate Design & Division Revenue Requirement

Rai	Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions	Period Definiti	ions									
-			Ċ	•	מַ (Revenue at			Revenue at		-	
5 2	Type of Charge	Units	3 4	Rate	,	Rate	Proposed Rate	<u>.</u>	Proposed Rate	\$	Increase	%
~	Customer Charges Summer	1,201	↔	10.00	↔	12,010	\$ 11.00	₩	13,211	\$ 2,1	1,201	10.0%
0 8	Winter Total	2,405	⇔	10.00	မာမ	24,050	\$ 11.00	မာမ	26,455 39,666	1	2,405 3,606	10.0% 10.0%
4	Energy Charges Summer	751.752	69	0.2200	€5	165.385	\$ 0.2295	€.	172,497	\$	12	4 3%
2	Winter	796,351		0.1000	. ↔	79,635	\$ 0.1043	↔	83,059	\$ 3,424	124	4.3%
9	Total	1,548,103			8	245,021		S	255,556	\$ 10,536	336	4.3%
7	System Charges Summer Only	379	↔	35.00	↔	13,265	\$ 37.50	S	14,213	6	948	7.1%
∞	Subtotal Base Revenue				↔	294,346		↔	309,435	\$ 15,089	680	5.1%
6	Fuel Surcharge	1,548,103	⇔	0.0944	æ	146,108	\$ 0.0944	ક	146,108	φ.	.1	%0.0
10	Rate "G" Total				⇔	440,454		↔	455,543	\$ 15,089	680	3.4%

Block Island Power Company

Commercial Demand (Rate "D") Rate Design - Division Rate Design & Division Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

Block Island Power Company

Public (Rate "P") Demand Rate Design - Division Rate Design & Division Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

%	10.00% 10.00% 10.00%	2.87% 2.81% 2.84%	10.00% 10.00% 10.00%	5.11%	%00.0	3.27%
Increase	\$ 108 \$ 216 \$ 324	\$ 1,134 \$ 1,057 \$ 2,191	\$ 2,025 \$ 1,220 \$ 3,245	\$ 5,760	÷	\$ 5,760
Revenue at Proposed Rate	\$ 1,188 \$ 2,376 \$ 3,564	\$ 40,614 \$ 38,652 \$ 79,266	\$ 22,275 \$ 13,415 \$ 35,690	\$ 118,519	\$ 63,633	\$ 182,152
Proposed Rate	\$ 16.50 \$ 16.50	\$ 0.1683	\$ 16.50 \$ 5.50		\$ 0.0908	
Revenue at Current Rate	\$ 1,080 \$ 2,160 \$ 3,240	\$ 39,480 \$ 37,595 \$ 77,075	\$ 20,250 \$ 12,195 \$ 32,445	\$112,760	\$ 63,633	\$176,392
Current Rate	\$ 15.00 \$ 15.00	\$ 0.16360 \$ 0.08180	\$ 15.00 \$ 5.00		\$ 0.0908	
Service Units	72 144 216	241,320 459,592 700,912	1,350 2,439 3,789		700,912	
Type of Charge	Customer Charges Summer Winter Total	Energy Charges Summer Winter Total	Demand Charges Summer Only Winter Total	Subtotal Base Revenue	Fuel Surcharge	Rate "P" Demand Total
N L	7 7 8	4 5 9	≻ 8 6	10	~	12

Block Island Power Company

Public (Rate "P") Non-Demand Rate Design - Division Rate Design & Division Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

8 E	Type of Charge	Service Units	0	Current Rate	R G	Revenue at Current Rate	Pre	Proposed Rate	Pro Pro	Revenue at Proposed Rate		Increase	% es
T 0 00	Customer Charges Summer Winter Total	52 104 156	↔ ↔	10.00	မ မ	520 1,040 1,560	\$ \$	11.00	es es es	572 1,144 1,716	$\Theta \Theta \Theta$	52 104 156	10.0% 10.0% 10.0%
4 5 9	Energy Charges Summer Winter Total	25,947 52,298 78,245	↔ ↔	0.2000	s s s	5,189 5,230 10,419	↔ ↔	0.2098	မ မ	5,444 5,486 10,930	$\varphi \varphi \varphi$	254 256 511	4 4 %0.9 %0.9 %0.9 %0.9 %0.9 %0.9 %0.9 %0.9
7	System Charges Summer Only	24	↔	37.50	\$	006	↔	37.50	8	006	↔	•	%0.0
∞	Subtotal Base Revenue				↔	12,879			↔	13,546	↔	299	5.2%
თ	Fuel Surcharge	78,245	↔	0.0908	8	7,104	↔	0.0908	\$	7,104	↔	ı	%0.0
10	Rate "P" Non-Demand Total	otal			↔	19,983			↔	20,649	↔	299	3.3%

Street Light (Rate "S") Rate Design - Division Rate Design & Division Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

					Re	Revenue			Re	Revenue			
-		Service	ರ	Current	ರ	at Current	Pro	Proposed	Pro	at Proposed		Increase	o.
ž	Type of Charge	Units		Rate		Rate	_	Rate		Rate		\$	%
_		852	↔	15.45	↔	13,163	↔	13.78	↔	\$ 11,741	↔	\$ (1,423)	-10.8%
7	Energy Charge	44,238	↔	ı	\$,	↔	\$ 0.0640	⇔	2,831	ક્ક	2,831	Σ
က	Subtotal Base Revenue				\$	13,163			↔	14,572	↔	1,408	10.7%
4	Fuel Surcharge	44,238 *	↔	ı	ઝ	:	↔	0.0852	ક્ક	3,769	ક્ક	3,769	Σ Z
വ	Rate "S" Total				↔	13,163			↔	18,341	↔	5,177	39.3%

Not applicable under current rates.

Block Island Power Company

Revenue Increase by Type of Charge - Division Rate Design & Division Revenue Requirement Rate Year - Current Seasonal Period Definitions

S 5	Rate Classification	Billing Units	Current Revenue	Proposed Revenue	Increase	%
~	Total Customer Charge Revenue	20,811	\$ 215,000	\$ 236,500	\$ 21,500	10.0%
- 2	Total Energy Charge Revenue	11,189,069	\$ 1,480,567	\$ 1,633,715	\$153,148	10.3%
က	Total Demand Charge Revenue	16,643	\$ 162,225	\$ 178,448	\$ 16,223	10.0%
4	Total System Charge Revenue	1,939	\$ 41,045	\$ 45,833	\$ 4,788	11.7%
5	Total Street Lighting Charge Revenue	852	\$ 13,163	\$ 11,741	\$ (1,423)	-10.8%
9	Total Revenue from Sales		\$ 1,912,001	\$ 2,106,236	\$ 194,235	10.2%
7	Fuel Surcharge	11,189,069	\$ 1,017,653	\$ 1,021,422	# 692,8	0.4%
ω	Late Charge Revenue		\$ 15,499	\$ 15,499	' ∽	%0:0
6	Other Revenue		* 181,758 *	\$ 181,758	' ⇔	%0.0
10	TOTAL REVENUE		\$ 3,126,911	\$ 3,324,914	\$ 198,004	6.3%
	 Other Revenue (Per Catlin TSC-1, page 1 of 2) Removal for Non-Payment Interest Income Rent - Lease Miscellaneous Revenue Total 		\$ 1,489 \$ 175,719 \$ 4,000 \$ 181,758			

[#] Fuel Surcharge revenue from Street Lighting would result in minor reductions in Fuel Surcharges for other classes.